

Tamalpais Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting: October 17th, 2018: 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: TCSD Cabin - 60 Tennessee Valley Road, Mill Valley

I) Call to Order: 7:06 PM – Doron Dreksler (Chair)

Board Members Present; Andrea Montalbano, Doron Dreksler, Logan Link, Alan Jones

II) Approval of Meeting Minutes dated 10/06/2018:

- Motion to Approve; LL. Second; AJ. Approval; Unanimous.

III) Correspondence and Announcements: DD announces that the 371 Shoreline Ave (7-11) sign permit application, that was supposed to be on this week's agenda, has been rescinded.

IV) Public Comment on Items not on the agenda:

- LL notes that she has noticed the U-Haul site is closed. Is there something that the TDRB can do to alert the new owner of the property about the Tam Plan?
 - DD will notify the Planning department that the new owner may be coming in to speak with them about potential for the site. The staff should make sure the new owners are aware they are controlled by the Tam Plan.
 - Kate Sears should be made her aware that there is potential for near-future development on the site.
 - The Board should be certain that the new staff at the Planning department is aware of the TDRB and its contents and applicability, for this project or any future ones. Maybe we can make a presentation to them with a summary of the Tam Plan?
- Members of the public arrive late for the 371 Shoreline Avenue (7-11) sign permit application and say that they are neighbors in close proximity and did not receive notice until that evening, in the mail. The Board tells them to tell the County Planning staff that this was not enough notice.

V) Agenda Items:

A) Gertz Variance; 907 Centro Way.

The applicant requests Variance approval to construct 446 square feet of a partial second-story addition to a 1,019-square-foot one-story single-family residence in the community of Homestead, Mill Valley. The 446 square feet of proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of over 38.7 percent on the 3,780 square foot lot. The proposed second-story addition would reach a maximum height of 29 feet, 8³/₄ inches above surrounding grade and the exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 41 feet from the northern front property line; 5 feet from the western side property line; 7 feet from the eastern side property line; and 40 feet from the southern rear property line. Variance approval is required because the project would result in floor area ratio of 38.7 where a maximum of 30 percent is permitted.

Zoning: R1-B1 (Single-family Residential, 6,000 square foot minimum lot area)

Countywide Plan Designation: SF6 (Single-family, 4-7 units/acre)

Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Community Plan

- Jeff Plonowski - Architect, presents project.
- The second floor addition would allow for the owners of 27 years to remain in their home, while aging in place.
- Their lot is substandard, and request a variance in order to create a Master bedroom suite on the second floor.
- The next door neighbor's FAR exceeds the allowable by a lot, much more than 38%.
- All existing materials and style of the house will be retained.
- They have provided letters of consent from all of the neighbors immediately adjacent including:
 - Mylett @ 910 West California
 - Turner @ 910 Centro Way
 - Grenville @ 905 Centro
 - White @ 911 Centro Way

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- How is drainage collected? Answer; It is emptied downhill with existing diffuser. No additional roof area will be added so drainage needs will not change.
- Is landscaped area affected? Answer; No.
- Will any neighbors' views be affected? Answer; The owners and designer stood on the second floors with neighbors and checked. Nobody's views will be impeded.

PUBLIC COMMENTS & CONCERNS: None.

BOARD COMMENTS & DISCUSSION:

- 38% FAR seems a reasonable size for a substandard lot.
- We have been made aware that the Planning staff does see a substandard size lot enough of a hardship to allow for exceeding the FAR.
- Leaving the carport open, rather than enclosing it as a garage, makes the site feel less full, which helps exceeding the FAR seem more reasonable.

BOARD ACTIONS:

- AM motions to approve as submitted. AJ seconds.
- Unanimous Approval

B) Hotel/ Rental Apartment Informal project presentation

150 Shoreline Ave, Manzanita Area of Tamalpais Area Plan

Presenter: Benjamin Paul Jones, Architect

- The allowable FAR by the County and the FAR allowed by the Tam Plan differ. The County allows for a higher FAR (.45) but the Tam plan only allows for an increased FAR for either “architectural merit” or “community benefit.”
- The Board discusses what these two things would mean to the community.
 - Look at what Proof Lab did as a model of “rural character”, with gravel lot, coffee shop, industrial building character and finishes, murals, green walls, interesting landscaping, etc.
 - A rooftop commercial space with outdoor seating, open to the public, would be a benefit to the community.
 - A ground floor commercial space open to the public, with outdoor seating, would be a benefit to the community.
 - A “parklet” utilizing the large median strip owned by the water district would be a great benefit to the community. It is across the driveway from an entrance to the bike path.

MEETING ADJOURNED 9:40 PM

Tamalpais Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting: December 5th, 2018: 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: TCSD Cabin - 60 Tennessee Valley Road, Mill Valley

I) **Call to Order:** 7:03 PM – Doron Dreksler (Chair)

Board Members Present; Andrea Montalbano, Doron Dreksler, Logan Link, Alan Jones (arrives during Correspondence)

II) **Approval of Meeting Minutes:** 11/07/2018

- Motion to Approve; LL. Second; AM. Approval; Unanimous. (AJ absent for this vote)

III) **Correspondence:**

- 1) In the interest of summarizing the Tam Plan, DD has found 4 letters written previously that pertain to it and should be looked at before a summary is created.
- 2) Watershed Alliance still wants to present to the Board and needs to be arranged.
- 3) DD checked into getting internet at the TCSD log cabin, and the Planning department said no due to funding, responsibility, etc.
- 4) Which board members will be available for a meeting on December the 19th? AM no, everyone else, yes.
- 5) LL suggests getting lighting in the TCSD parking lot. She will contact TCSD about it.
- 6) Rotating officer positions will take place during the first meeting of the year.

IV) **Items not on the Agenda:** None.

V) **Agenda Items:**

1) **Besse Variance:** *Address: 40 Castle Rock Drive, Mill Valley, CA 94941 Parcel Number: 047-051-24 Planner: Leslie Lacko Project Number: P2057 Applicant: Seth Besse PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Variance approval to construct a new 791-square-foot addition to a residence on a developed lot in Mill Valley. The 791 square feet of proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 15 percent on the 13,964-square-foot lot. The proposed addition would reach a maximum height of 23.5 feet above surrounding grade and the exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 7 feet 6 inches from the East front property line; 14 feet from the North side property line; 13 feet from the South side property line; 126 feet from the West rear property line. Variance approval is required because the project does not meet the 25-foot front setback normally required in the R1 Zone pursuant to Marin County Development Code Section 22.54.020. Zoning: R1 (Single-family Residential, 7,500 square foot minimum lot area) Countywide Plan Designation: SF6 (Single-family, 4-7 units/acre Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Community Plan*

- Project is presented by Seth Besse.

- Project is returning to the Board because the application was deemed incomplete. It should not have come to the Board previously. The project is explained.

- Changes to the plans since the last presentation include an increased paved street area for one off street parking space.

- BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Q: How will the retaining wall be finished?
- A: as board formed concrete.
- Q: How will the site handle the increased run off from the new roof area?
- A: There is no easy way to have any on site water retention.
 - Is it possible to use permeable pavers at the new parking space?
 - Can you repave the parking space behind the house with permeable paving?
- BOARD ACTIONS:
- AJ motions; Motion to approve as submitted with merit comment to mitigate runoff in the future wherever possible. AM seconds
- Unanimous approval.

2) O'Donnell Financial Group LLC Master Plan Amendment and Design Review: *Address: Vacant Lot on Shoreline Highway, Mill Valley, CA 94941 Parcel Number: 052-371-03 Planner: Immanuel Bereket Project Number: P2231 Applicant: Benjamin Jones Architect PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Master Plan Amendment and Design Review approval to construct a new two-story, 11,490-square-foot mixed-use development on a vacant lot in Mill Valley. The 11,490 square feet of proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 44 percent on the 25,557 square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 33 feet 7 inches above surrounding grade and exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 32 feet 5 inches from the south front property line; 23 feet from the east side property line; 49 feet from the west side property line; and 44 feet from the north rear property line. Various site improvements would also be entailed in the proposed development, including a new concrete curb, sidewalk and landscaping at the current entrance at Shorelines Blvd. Master Plan Amendment is required because the project site is in a Master Plan area. Design Review approval is required because the is located in a Planned District. Zoning: CP (Planned Commercial) Countywide Plan Designation: GC (General Commercial/Mixed Use, FAR = 0.10 to .020); PF (Public Facility) Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Community Plan*

-Benjamin Jones, Architect, presents.

- County has allowed the project to assume base grade as 3' above existing in order to reach minimum elevation of flood plain. Total project height will be measured from this elevation.

- Amenities have been added to project since preliminary presentation to Tam DRB on 10/17/2018, including;

- Cafe on first floor open to public
- EV charging stations (public or private unclear in meeting)
- Bicycle parking in front of hotel
- Other changes to plans include;
 - Bio-swale at south side of property
 - Tile base at base of building (if within budget)
 - Pavers at base of redwood tree to provide porous paving for roots
- Basic building features include:
 - Extended stay hotel plus 5 year round units (1 "affordable")

- Cement plaster walls
- metal windows, balconies, trellis and columns
- standing seam metal roof
- Site lighting is contained on building, not on free standing poles

BOARD QUESTIONS

- Q: In what way are you proposing to amend the allowable FAR?
- A: Unsure. The allowable FAR is slightly unclear. The County zoning says .35, the Tam Plan says .30. The Tam Plan allows for a project to exceed .30 in circumstances where the project meets certain conditions. The project is designed with an FAR of .45.
- Q: When was the Master plan completed? Does it precede the Tam Plan? We are unsure of exactly what you are asking to amend.
- A: I just received the summary of the Planning history of this parcel this morning. At this moment it is unclear what the Master plan says and requires.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

- Q: Is there a fire rated corridor in the building?
- A: The project is still in the design development phase but when it is finally submitted for permit it will meet all code requirements.
- Q: What is the 6" black square shown on the drawings within the units? Is this a post?
- A: No these are markers for where the bed frame goes.
- Q: Are you going to do a traffic study? It is very difficult to turn left onto Shoreline from the east side of Shoreline Highway. This project could increase traffic. There is great concern about evacuation routes. This project is on a major evacuation escape route.
- A: We are not proposing a formal traffic study but we are aware of the problem of turning left from the site. We will need to look at it and make the best decision. It is possible we will require a right turn only from the site. We expect a lot of the people who are staying at the place to use public transportation, being so close to the bus stop.
- Q: Why is the project proposed in a location that always floods? Isn't there a better place for a project like this?
- A: The property has been bought and the owner feels this is a good location for this use, as it is so close to a bus route and the high way on-ramp. There are only 5 long term rental units proposed, only 1 of which is affordable, but Marin is in desperate need of any type of housing and this project will fill some of that need. The proposed on site water retention area will only help the flooding problem.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- The Tam Plan says that the height limit for buildings on the east side of Shoreline Highway is 25'. This project exceeds this height.
- There is a conflict in the Tam plan. One area says the height limit is 25', another says it is 30'.
- It is impossible to rule on this when the Board does not understand exactly what the Master plan says, what the amendments to the plan have been approved already, and what the applicant is asking to amend.

BOARD ACTIONS:

- AJ motions that the Board rule the project as submitted is incomplete, based on the fact that the constraints of the Master plan and the requested amendment is unclear.

- AM seconds

- Unanimous approval.

V) Meeting adjourned: 8:37 PM.

Tamalpais Design Review Board Meeting Minutes
Regular Meeting: July 3rd, 2019, 7:00 PM
Meeting Location: TCSD Cabin - 60 Tennessee Valley Road, Mill Valley

I) Call to Order: 7pm - Andrea Montalbano (Chair)

Board Members Present: Andrea Montalbano (AM), Doron Dreksler (DD), Logan Link (LL), Alan Jones (AJ)

II) Approval of minutes: June 19th, 2019

- Motion to approve: AJ; Second: DD; unanimous approval

III) Correspondence:

- AM received, and passes along to the board, two letters regarding the proposed project at 150 Shoreline Hwy. One letter is from Sustainable Tam Almonte; the other from Linda Rames, president of the Almonte District Improvement Club.
- LL has been working on having a “no overnight parking” rule put into place on Almonte Blvd, from Tam Junction to the red curb across from the Rosemont Bus Stop. This is an ongoing problem causing strain for local businesses who rely on having a fair shot at the parking spaces for employees; there have also been complaints of individuals sleeping in their cars, leaving behind litter, etc. The County traffic engineer will perform a site evaluation and will likely reach out to the TDRB, and others, for opinion.
- DD is continuing to work on composing a letter to the County addressing the lightning issues occurring at the Muir Woods Lodge. DD will not be able to attend the next meeting but will send a draft to AM for review.
- AJ asks for confirmation that the Alta Way letter has been sent to the County. AM confirms and adds that planner Jason Wong acknowledged receipt.

IV) Items not on the agenda / public comment:

- Community member Steve Levine brings up that there are two outdated “no left turn” signs posted at the Chevron station on the corner of Tam Junction. These signs have been irrelevant since barricades were introduced some time ago. They are very large and prominent.
- Board agrees that the gas station corner will be an important part of the upcoming TDRB package on Tam Junction signage violations.

V) Agenda Items:

1. O’Donnell Financial Group Master Plan Amendment / Design Review

Vacant Lot on Shoreline Highway, Mill Valley, CA 94941 Parcel Number: 052-371-03

The applicant requests Master Plan Amendment and Design Review approval to construct a new two-story, 10,887-square-foot mixed-use development on a vacant lot in Mill Valley. The 10,887 square feet of proposed development would utilize the State Density Bonus to increase density

and result in a floor area ratio of 42.2 percent on the 25,557 square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 39 feet 8 inches above surrounding grade and exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 33 feet from the north front property line; 23 feet from the east side property line; 49 feet from the west side property line; and 49 feet 10 inches from the south rear property line. Various site improvements would also be entailed in the proposed development, including a new concrete curb, sidewalk and landscaping at the current entrance at Shorelines Blvd.

Master Plan Amendment is required because the project site is in a Master Plan area. Design Review approval is required because the project is located in a Planned District.

Zoning: CP (Planned Commercial)

Countywide Plan Designation: GC (General Commercial/Mixed Use, FAR = 0.10 to .020); PF (Public Facility)

Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Community Plan

Plans can be viewed at:

https://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/projects/tamalpais-valley/odonnell-financial-group_mp_dr_p2231_mv

Presentation by Benjamin Jones (BJ), architect:

- BJ presents plans on large projector to allow public to view.
- County project planner Immanuel Bereket has instructed BJ that the intricacies of project/planning for this property will be handed at staff level and have instructed him to only discuss design with the board. This brings up objections from the board; board does not agree with this view.
- Project is 21 units and two stories. A density bonus for affordable housing has been calculated.
- A construction management plan has been created.
- Site is tight due to easements, including two PG&E easements and a sanitary sewer easement, as well as traffic corridors.
- Through the front entry will be a lobby/café, with 10 living units on the main level and 11 units above.
- Garden space wraps around the side and back of the building.
- Height is 30ft – there was a typo in the transmittal from planning. Board acknowledges awareness of this transmittal error.
- Landscape plan has been created with a goal of improving the view from the street and includes trees and layered landscaping; “soft layered edge.”
- The plan includes connecting to the existing sidewalk, wrapping it around the building.
- Bioretention basin in the back and pervious pavement to assist with drainage.
- Civil engineer has done a hydrology report.
- BJ shows historical slides of Mill Valley, showing that the town was mostly open space in 1910. Also includes images of Manzanita today for contrast.
- BJ says that a goal of this building is to “radically improve the area.” This is the last site open lot on the block and could “set the tone for everything else.”

- Footprint is approx. 5,000sqft per floor.
- Mixed use: residential apartments, extended stay hotel, and café/porch.
- “Classical” style architecture.
- Materials include: ceramic panels at the base, cement plaster walls, cast stone and metal components. Detailing includes: columns, trellis pieces, and a glass roof.
- Idea is to look like a large house.
- Flat roof with solar panel and the potential of a rooftop garden.

Questions from Board / Board Discussion with Applicant:

- AJ asks applicant to describe what master plan changes he is proposing. BJ says that he has been instructed by the County to not answer this question.
- AJ says that this method is not the view of the board.
- AJ questions if 30ft is the allowable height for this location via the Tam Plan. AM believes it is but this needs to be confirmed.
- BJ says that there is flexibility with these rules and that the office building project (proposed for this site several years ago) was higher.
- BJ adds that the County is helping by applying the density bonus.
- AM notes that, to qualify for the floor-area-ratio density bonus, one must conform with height rules. The Tam Plan does say 30ft in the appendices but there may be a conflict elsewhere in the plan; an important question that need clarity.
- AM asks who owns the site behind; BJ shares that much of it is right-of-way and easements for State Route 56. Community member Clayton Smith volunteers that the Hallmark family owns much of the area.
- AM asks for a better understanding of the community garden. BJ says that this is currently an area with grasses and trees. They plan to landscape two sides, on top of the PG&E easements.
- AM asks what type of trees are planned and at what size. BJ answers that these will be 24 – 26 inch boxes of Japanese Maples.
- AM notes that one corner of the building is very prominent, as it is a first impression when exiting the highway into Mill Valley. Expresses concern that this corner has not been given as much detailing and attention as the building’s main entry.
- AJ asks if there is a rendering that shows the adjacent buildings; BJ has this and shares with the board.
- AM notes that, during a TDRB informal review with BJ, the board provided feedback and that the building aesthetic and style needs to reflect the character of the community and gave suggestions for ways to do this. No adjustments have been made in response to this; nothing has changed. The materials and style are still of concern / conflict with the character of the community.
- LL points out that the the building is very solid, lacking the “airiness” / connection to nature of the Tam area aesthetic.
- DD provides advice to BJ: the porch must be handicap accessible; board would like to see a landscaping plan, California native plants are strongly encouraged; lighting should be looked at and adjusted to comply with guidelines; board would like to see a materials board.
- DD asks about parking; there are 20 spaces.

- AM again encourages changes in materials and adds that it would be helpful to see a rendering of the view from the highway / off ramp.
- AM adds that a rooftop deck will likely not be possible due to lack of access.

Public Comment:

- A longtime Tam Valley resident values the rural feel of the area and says that it seems the building does not fit in with Tam Valley. Because of the design, it looks very large. Also concerned about drainage and water.
- BJ responds that the water percolates and, additionally, drainage surrounds the property.
- Resident Clayton Smith (CS) is extremely familiar with the property – his wife has had an office in building A for forty years. CS shares the following insight about the subject parcel:
 - Water is a major problem; the drain function needs to be worked on.
 - Due to lack of sunlight, trees will not successfully grow.
 - Very damp site; anticipate mold issues.
 - Including a café is inappropriate due to lack of parking. Parking is a prominent issue; every space is consumed. Expresses much concern about issues arising from lack of parking.
 - In response to previous comments from applicant about the need to drastically improve the area, CS points out that the existing options in this office/mixed use area is already of value to residents; it offers a somewhat affordable place for many locals to keep offices and small businesses.
 - Uncontrolled intersection adds complications and is another reason why a café is inappropriate.
 - Bedrock here is 100 ft down; asks BJ if pilings will be necessary. BJ says it's possible but unlikely, as this will be built on a floating slab. CS requests ample notice to neighboring businesses of any piling installations, as the noise and disruption will be impactful. BJ agrees, has project coordinator for this.
 - The site is infested with rodents; rats and mice will be an issue for gardens and garbage. BJ responds that the garbage is in a standalone building with a roof.
 - CS feels strongly that no trees in the back area should be cut; BJ assures that no trees will be removed from the back.
 - CS asks who will manage the hotel; BJ says this will be a professional company.
 - Expresses concern that there is no place for long term renters to store things, which will be important given the very compact size of the units.
 - When the tides are high the area is so flooded that it is not possible to be a pedestrian. This also impacts transit; the bus often cannot/will not stop there.
- Local, a resident of Issaquah Dock in North Sausalito's houseboat community and a Sierra Club board member (not present in official capacity), notes that traffic in the Manzanita area is problematic. Visits a chiropractor around mid-day in the middle of the week – it often takes four minutes to exit the property to turn left onto Shoreline.
- Also brings up concerns about flooding, noting that this is already an issue and sea level is expected to raise 10 feet in 10 years.

Board Discussion:

- LL opens up conversation about sea level rise and the potential issues that climate change is expected to create for site like this; questions if it is responsible to allow residential building without precautions that take this into account.
- Discussion ensues about the need for clarity /understanding of County plans for this general area, both for this project and others. LL recommends requesting a meeting of the TDRB with planners; board agrees. AM will send letter to County Planning and Supervisors.
- There is also a lack of clarity about what exemption the board is being asked to make.
- AM notes that she does not feel comfortable with the design and that, if building is going to be allowed by the County, it must address future problems.
- Board would like to see more integration of design suggestions brought up in past informal review with applicant, including adjustment to design to complement the character of the community.

Motion:

AM brings a motion to rule as incomplete for the reasons outlined below; AJ seconds; unanimous approval.

- The board would like clarity on the legality of why and how the density bonus supersedes Tam Plan.
- The board has been given no information about the master plan and proposed changes.
- It is unclear how the FAR relates to the master plan.
- The board needs a clearer idea of the mass in relation to the site and surrounding areas / the building to context, as well as the visuals of the approach - especially from the Highway 101 off-ramp.
- The board has concerns about the proposed materials and conflicts with community character.

2. Review and discussion of Tamalpais Junction and Manzanita area commercial sign regulation infractions per board member analysis:

Board discusses next steps for compilation of a package for planning, which will highlight signage infractions in the Tam Junction and Manzanita areas. At previous meeting, each member was assigned printouts of several photos of potential violations to assess.

- AM will send digital copies.
- LL presents a document that she created for her assigned images, quoting specific excerpts from the Tam Plan. Rest of board likes this format and takes note of this template.
- Board members agree to continue working on this project at the next meeting.

3. Review, and a vote to adopt, TDRB submittal requirements documents

Board has been compiling a handout for applicants that outlines the process of design review, including a list of required and suggested items. AM presents most recent draft.

DD makes a motion to approve and adopt, making this document available so the public can better understand the process and requirements; AJ seconds; unanimous approval.

VI) Public in attendance:

Michael Kross; Wellesley Avenue, Mill Valley
Steve Levine; Glenwood Avenue, Mill Valley
Art and Claudia Yow; Fairview Avenue, Mill Valley
Mickey Allison; Waldo Point Harbor, Sausalito
Clayton Smith; Carrera Drive, Mill Valley

VII) Meeting adjourned: 10:05pm

Tamalpais Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting: December 18th, 2019, 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: TCSD Cabin - 60 Tennessee Valley Road, Mill Valley

I) Call to Order: 7:08pm - Andrea Montalbano (Chair)

Board Members Present: Andrea Montalbano (AM), Doron Dreksler (DD), Logan Link (LL)

II) Approval of minutes: December 4th, 2019

- Motion to approve: DD; Second: AM; unanimous approval

III) Correspondence:

Transformers on Panoramic Highway:

- AM shares that large transformers have recently been installed on Panoramic Hwy, close to the point where four corners meets Hwy 1 and in front of a water view.
- AM is looking into how this may or may not comply with the Tam Plan.

TDRB Term Expiration and Board Vacancy:

- LL shares that her term on the board expires in March of 2020 and asks fellow board members if they know how to go about renewing.
- AM and DD, who have both renewed terms in the past, recommend contacting Supervisor Sears and her team directly.
- On a related note, board member Erin Alley has decided not to continue on as a TDRB member. LL points out that there may be an official form or process for filling a vacancy. AM and DD do not think there is, but LL will look into it.

IV) Items not on the agenda / public comment:

Concerns about 5G:

- Architect Benjamin Jones voices concerns about the general concept of 5G, stating that it should not be allowed. Local resident Marcel Mead agrees, as do DD and LL.
- Jones and DD further explain some of the health issues involved with 5G.
- AM asks if 5G is common in Europe. Jones shares that 5G was tested in Belgium and resulted in the death of a significant amount of birds.
- DD shares that, several years ago, the board was involved in preventing the installation of three cellular towers for various reasons.
- Board agrees that this is an important topic to look into.

V) Agenda Items:

O'Donnell Financial Group Master Plan Amendment / Design Review (P2231) | Vacant Lot at 150 Shoreline Highway, Mill Valley, CA 94941 | Parcel Number: 052-371-03 | Project Planner: Immanuel Bereket, 415.473.2755 | Applicant: Benjamin Jones, Architect, 415.858.5525

The applicant requests Master Plan Amendment and Design Review approval to construct a new two-story, 10,887-square-foot mixed-use development on a vacant lot in Mill Valley. The 10,887 square feet of proposed development would utilize the State Density Bonus to increase density and result in a floor area ratio of 42.2 percent on the 25,557 square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 29 feet 8 inches above surrounding grade and exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 33 feet from the north front property line; 23 feet from the east side property line; 49 feet from the west side property line; and 49 feet 10 inches from the south rear property line. Various site improvements would also be entailed in the proposed development, including a new concrete curb, sidewalk and landscaping at the current entrance at Shorelines Blvd.

Master Plan Amendment is required because the project site is in a Master Plan area. Design Review approval is required because the is located in a Planned District.

Zoning: CP (Planned Commercial) | Countywide Plan Designation: GC (General Commercial/Mixed Use, FAR = 0.10 to .020); PF (Public Facility) | Community Plan: Tamalpais Community Plan

Link to most recent project plans can be found at:

https://www.marincounty.org/-/media/files/departments/cd/planning/currentplanning/projects/o-donnell-financial_mp_dr_mv/odonnell-revised-plans-6319.pdf?la=en

Presentation by Benjamin Jones, Architect:

- Jones notes that the agenda is not fully updated to reflect current plans.
- Jones also shares that the property owner has a full legal team speaking directly with planning about this project; Jones's job, and the focus of tonight's meeting, is only design.
- The board has seen most everything included in the updated plans; changes/additions are outlined in bubble-like boxes.
- The lower level of the project houses apartments; the upper level houses extended stay units. These could, potentially, be utilized like apartments in the future.
- A specific type of tree has been chosen for prominent locations. This is the same species that sits near the Barrel House in Sausalito.
- A hydraulic plan has been developed.
- An enclosable porch has the potential to add interest to the front corner of the building.
- Jones feels that the building is most prominent when driving Southbound from Tam Junction towards the highway, rather than from the highway off-ramp that leads into the Manzanita area.

- To show the site from various angles, Jones shares a powerpoint with Google Map streetview images.

Board Discussion with Applicant:

- DD feels that the proposed building is very visible from the highway off-ramp. DD demonstrates this by comparing the buildings that can be seen in Google Map images with the existing buildings on the site plan.
- Jones shares that the lot has been owned by the same person for many years. Proposed past uses include a gas station; an office building; and a deli and apartments. Jones feels that neighbors are tired of this vacant lot being in disrepair.
- LL clarifies that O'Donnell Financial has owned this lot for many years; Jones confirms that this is correct.
- AM asks if this is a serious liquefaction site. Jones replies that it is instead marsh land; the water flows in and out with the tides.
- Jones notes that the owner of the newly opened Floodwater bar and restaurant is all about cleaning up the area. LL asks Jones if he has spoken to the owner of Floodwater about the proposed project; Jones has not.
- Jones offers to gather letters from neighbors; LL replies that this would be great and very helpful.
- Jones shows several photos of Tam Junction and shares his struggle to pull inspiration from existing community character.
- Jones shares images of the aesthetic style of the proposed building, citing the Dutch Colonial Revival Style of Alys Beach and the existing look of the Buckeye, original Fireside building, and Floodwater as somewhat similar designs.
- The primary material proposed is cement plaster.
- Jones clarifies that the enclosable front porch is a new addition to the plans, as is the arrangement of the apartments. The East side gardens and façade have also been adjusted.
- Jones shares images of potential color palettes, including a mock-up displaying a more "rustic" / deep earth tone option with a plinth base. Jones would not recommend the use of wood siding.
- Jones clarifies that he simply plugged in sample colors, but ultimately feels the color palette should go in a pastel direction (rather than the deeper earth tones shown).
- LL asks board at what point exact colors are chosen in a project like this one. AM replies that this is an item that should be ironed out in design review.
- DD asks Jones to confirm the building height; Jones says that it is 30 feet about the FEMA flood plane.
- AM shares that she looked though the Tam Plan from start to finish to see specifically what points should be considered for this project. To begin, LU 1.2: preserving natural and cultural characteristics of the site. AM asks Jones to discuss what, on the site, will be built vs. left natural.
- Jones replies that the boundary is left natural, noting that the new building will create an accessible pathway. Also to be included are marsh-appropriate trees and a garden

that connects with an existing garden nearby, planted with low ground cover and climbing plants. Coffeeberry trees will be planted in the bioswale area.

- AM views the landscaping plan and feels that there must be more variation.
- Jones offers to create a landscaping color palette.
- AM inquires about planting in the entryway off of Shoreline; Jones replies that this area is not owned by O'Donnell Financial.
- AM also brings up section LU.13 of the Tam Plan, which discusses compatible design. AM notes that the commonality in the Tam Junction area is that most all of the buildings, with the exception of the Fireside, are box-like in shape and whole (without ornate detailing). After recent renovations, Floodwater matches this style also. AM expresses that the proposed project is too fine-grained to match with this style.
- Jones understands and says that he has been trying to find a balance. AM recommends removing many of the details.
- DD agrees, noting that the Fireside was used as a railroad building and is no longer a functional part of the area. DD also points out that the proposed development will be used in a residential fashion and should be designed with the residential experience in mind.
- Further observations are that the building has a library-like feeling, with everything breaking down into details that are very small. This style is perhaps better suited for an urban environment where things are viewed from closer proximity.
- AM recommends dialing back the amount of decoration to a more streamlined form and adjusting the scale become more similar to industrial buildings. DD agrees.
- DD points out that parking is already an issue in the area with the addition of Floodwater. Jones acknowledges that this is correct.
- LL asks how many spots are included in the proposed project; Jones replies that there are 20 spaces and 21 units.
- AM moves to Tam Plan Appendix D, Design Character. AM begins by confirming that the building is more than 100 ft from the shoreline; this is correct.
- AM asks if there are screened areas for trash; there are.
- AM asks about roof materials; Jones shares that the corner is standing seam metal and the rest is a flat roof. Roof equipment is concealed completely. Solar panels and other reflective materials are either below the parapet or very minimal. There are no rooftop antennas.
- AM confirms that Jones will pull together a palette of plant materials; Jones agrees.
- AM asks if utilities are underground; they are. Easements are in place to add to the existing transformers.
- AM points out that paving materials should be compatible with the architecture.
- Signage has not been fully developed.
- LL asks if the front sidewalk and grass is officially part of the property and project. It is not. Jones clarifies that, when discussing the creation of an accessible path, he is referring to the area directly along the side of the building. This will be publically usable space.
- Board and applicant feel that this has been a productive meeting; all would like to continue the discussion after the agreed upon changes have been implemented.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Motion:

AM makes a motion to deny Design Review approval, based on the merit comments outlined below. DD seconds; unanimous approval.

Merit comments:

There are certain elements of the project that do not presently match the guidelines in the Tam Plan. These elements include:

- Colors
- Landscaping
- Signage
- Paving: textured paving must be incorporated.
- Detailing: detailing must be adjusted to become more in keeping with community character.
- Materials: a material board must be presented.

VI) Public in attendance:

Marcel Mead, Mill Valley

VII) Meeting adjourned: 9:20pm